

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DARREN STRIBLING,
Plaintiff,

v.

HEIDI WASHINGTON,
et al.,
Defendant.

Case No. 22-12990

Judith E. Levy
United States District Judge

Curtis Ivy, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge

**AMENDED ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO ANSWER (ECF No. 73)**

Plaintiff Darren Stribling, proceeding without the assistance of counsel, filed this lawsuit on October 30, 2020. (ECF No. 1). This matter was referred to the undersigned for all pretrial matters. (ECF No. 12).

Motions to extend time are governed by Rule 6(b)(1)(A), which states, “[w]hen an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time . . . if the request is made before the original time or its extension expires.” The decision to extend a time limit is within the discretion of the district court. *Ott v. Fed. Home Loan Mortg. Corp.*, 535 F. App’x 488, 489 (6th Cir. 2013).

Defendants sought this extension within the time to act, therefore, the good cause standard governs. Defendants assert that Plaintiff served his verified supplemental complaint on February 28, 2023, but that they did not receive the

complaint until March 14, 2023, when the complaint was filed on the electronic filing system. (ECF No. 73). Defendants indicate that the amended complaint contains new allegations that require more time to investigate. (*Id.*). The Court finds good cause to **GRANT** Defendants' timely motion for extension of time. Defendants requested a 21-day extension to answer. Defendants' answer is due **April 7, 2023**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The parties here may object to and seek review of this Order, but are required to file any objections within 14 days of service as provided for in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a) and Local Rule 72.1(d). A party may not assign as error any defect in this Order to which timely objection was not made. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). Any objections are required to specify the part of the Order to which the party objects and state the basis of the objection. When an objection is filed to a magistrate judge's ruling on a non-dispositive motion, the ruling remains in effect unless it is stayed by the magistrate judge or a district judge. E.D. Mich. Local Rule 72.2.

Date: March 16, 2023

s/Curtis Ivy, Jr.
Curtis Ivy, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on March 16, 2023, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Kristen MacKay
Case Manager
(810) 341-7850